

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. In the Final Office Action of March 2, 2010, claims 1-27 were rejected.

With this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 12 and 13 are amended.

I. 35 U.S.C. §103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-22, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(q) as being anticipated by or under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tamura* (U.S. Publication No. 2002-0168572) (“*Tamura*”) in view of *Idota* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,235,427) (“*Idota*”).

Claims 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tamura* in view of *Idota* and in further view of *Morishima* (U.S. Publication No. 2003-0054253). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In relevant part, each of the independent claims 1, 2, 12 and 13 recite an electrode which includes a thin film layer on a portion of a surface of an active material layer containing at least one of copper and nickel provided on the active material layer.

This is clearly unlike *Tamura*, *Idota* and *Morishima* which fail to disclose or even fairly suggest a thin film layer on a portion of a surface of an active material layer. Instead, *Tamura* discloses a surface coating on an active material layer without disclosing anything pertaining to the amount the surface area covers the active material layer. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0168572, Para. [0010]. *Idota* discloses a silicic material coated with a plurality of metals without disclosing the amount the metals cover the silicic material. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,235,427, Col. 2, l. 39-45. *Morishima* fails to disclose any type of thin film, much less a thin film on a portion of an active material layer.

As the Applicants' specification teaches, by providing an electrode which includes a thin film layer on a portion of a surface of an active material layer containing at least one of copper and nickel provided on the active material layer, the thin film can be deposited on to the active material layer using numerous manufacturing methods. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0234861, Paras. [0042].

Therefore, because *Tamura*, *Idota*, *Morishima* and any combination of them fails to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claims 1, 2, 12 and 13, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 12 and 13 cannot stand. Because claims 3-11 and 14-27 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 2, 12 and 13, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 2, 2010

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Willis Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000